



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Human Rights Act Repeal and Devolution

Citation for published version:

Bell, C, *Human Rights Act Repeal and Devolution*, 2015, Web publication/site, Centre on Constitutional Change Blog. <<http://centreonconstitutionalchange.ac.uk/blog/human-rights-act-repeal-and-devolution-0>>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Bell, C. (Author). (2015). Human Rights Act Repeal and Devolution. Centre on Constitutional Change Blog.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





Centre on Constitutional Change
Researching the issues. Informing the debate.

[Contact us](#)

Search



[About](#)

[Blogs & news](#)

[Multimedia](#)

[Projects](#)

[Events](#)

[Research briefings](#)

[Home](#) » [Blogs](#) » Human Rights Act Repeal and Devolution

Human Rights Act Repeal and Devolution



There has already been discussion of the implications of repealing the Human Rights Act (and leaving the ECHR) on devolution. Prof Christine Bell highlights that the UK government will need the consent of the devolved legislatures to proceed.

The Conservative government's proposed repeal of the Human Rights Act (HRA) and possible withdrawal from the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and Council of Europe, would have far-reaching implications for the UK's devolved administrations and relations with the Republic of Ireland. These run deep into the constitutional marrow of the nations involved; so deep that it is difficult to see how repeal of the Act could take place without their consent. The government's difficulties in relation to, especially, Scotland and Northern Ireland are significant but different and worth reviewing separately.

In Scotland, the ECHR – which the HRA establishes in UK law – is written into the legislation that created the devolved administration in the first place. The Scotland Act 1998 gives powers to the Scottish Parliament so long as it complies with the ECHR - among other things. Repealing the HRA would not, in and of itself, remove that obligation. While it would be technically possible to keep the ECHR as a framework for devolved government, even if the UK were not a member of the Council of Europe and were no longer bound by the treaty, it would be very strange to have it form a part of the constitutional basis of devolution. Moreover, it could lead to chronic uncertainty: withdrawal from the ECHR and the European Court of Human Rights' (ECtHR) supervision of rights, would be likely to make it unclear how 'compliance' with the ECHR was to be evaluated, and whether interpretations by the Strasbourg Courts were to be taken into account or not.

There are further devolved complications with repealing the Human Rights Act. Human rights are partially devolved in Scotland, where the devolved institutions have the power to protect and promote them. The Scottish Parliament, for example, has set up a Scottish Human Rights Commission. Therefore, any unilateral repeal of the HRA by Westminster would be likely to violate the Sewell Convention, whereby the Westminster government will 'not normally legislate with regard to devolved matters in Scotland without the consent of the Scottish Parliament'. Similar understandings apply through memoranda of understandings with each of the devolved legislatures in the UK.

The repeal of the HRA also raises problems in Northern Ireland, where a similar commitment not to legislate against the wishes of the NI Assembly exists. Successive UK governments have considered proposed amendments to the HRA for Northern Ireland, to require a legislative consent motion, arguing that their hands are tied on human rights legislation if the devolved power-sharing government do not consent. In Northern Ireland, human rights are even further devolved than in Scotland, and the Human Rights Act is explicitly mentioned in the Northern Ireland Act 1998, meaning that it would have to be amended immediately if the Human Rights Act were repealed, with a number of consequential legal amendments in other devolved legislation.

Additionally, the commitment to the Human Rights Act mechanism was also put in detail into the Belfast or Good Friday Agreement which forms the constitutional DNA of the Northern Ireland Act 1998. The Agreement has also been found by courts to be, in effect, the 'constitutional underpinning' of the Northern Ireland Act.

The UK government as part of the peace agreement also signed a legally binding international treaty with the Republic of Ireland government, where both committed to implement the Agreement commitments that required action on each government's part. The Republic of Ireland, as part its implementation of the Agreement and Treaty, changed its Constitution removing the historic claims to jurisdiction over Northern Ireland, and incorporated the ECHR into its law, as part of the reciprocal agreement to 'match' human rights provisions in the UK (in part to assuage Unionist concerns). Any unilateral move away from these commitments carries major democratic legitimacy and bad faith consequences, with deep and problematic historical resonances. The Irish government has expressed its 'dismay' at the proposals. In fact normal UK practice would be to take treaty obligations extremely seriously and not to unilaterally breach them because they have become politically difficult.

So, to summarise, repeal of the Human Rights Act would require the consent of the devolved legislatures and the Republic of Ireland. Even if such consent was forthcoming, moving away from the Human Rights Act could be considered a breach of the Belfast or Good Friday Agreement by the 'people of the island of Ireland, North and South', who formally ratified the Agreement with its explicit commitment to the Human Rights Act mechanism, in a referendum, and could be similarly so seen by all those who voted for devolution in Scotland and Wales, who view rights as part of their common and devolved constitutional framework. Paradoxically, repeal of the Human Rights Act would also dismantle one of the increasingly few value-driven components of the Union that currently act as its fast-eroding glue.



Share



Disqus
Facebook Connect
Google Analytics

[This article is based on a longer research briefing.](#)

0 Comments

The Future of the UK and Scotland

1 Login ▾

♥ Recommend

↗ Share

Sort by Best ▾



Start the discussion...

Be the first to comment.

✉ Subscribe

D Add Disqus to your site

🔒 Privacy

Comments policy

All comments posted on the site via Disqus are automatically published. Additionally comments are sent to moderators for checking and removal if necessary. We encourage open debate and real time commenting on the website. The Centre on Constitutional Change cannot be held responsible for any content posted by users. Any complaints about comments on the site should be sent to

info@centreonconstitutionalchange.ac.uk

'Beyond Smith' e-book


Post by Christine Bell

We use cookies on this website. By using this site, you agree that we may store and access

cookies on your device. [Find out more here](#)



Find other posts by Christine Bell



Disqus
Facebook Connect
Google Analytics

Blogs & news

Blogs & news

News Archive

Latest blogs

Human Rights Act Repeal and Devolution

17th June 2015

How much is too much borrowing?

17th June 2015

The politics of welfare in Northern Ireland

12th June 2015

Prof Keating wins top award from Aberdeen University

10th June 2015

Costs and benefits of 'Scotlinavia'

10th June 2015

[Read More Posts](#)

We use cookies on this website. By using this site, you agree that we may store and access

cookies on your device. [Find out more here](#)



Disqus
Facebook Connect
Google Analytics

Site topics

Barnett Formula British and Scottish politics campaign coalition

constitution culture currency **devolution** devolution proposals

economy education energy & environment England **EU** EVEL events

federalism **fiscal policy** **general election** health Human Rights

identity indyref result international migration Nordic Model Northern Ireland

policy **public attitudes** science security & defence **Smith**

Commission SNP Social media **voting** Wales **welfare** young voter

We use cookies on this website. By using this site, you agree that we may store and access

cookies on your device. [Find out more here](#)



Disqus
Facebook Connect
Google Analytics

Authors

Angus Armstrong

David Bell

Paul Cairney

Daniel Cetrà

David Eiser

Colin Fleming

Malcolm Harvey

Ailsa Henderson

Charlie Jeffery

Michael Keating

Craig McAngus

Nicola McEwen

Duncan Morrow

Kirstein Rummery

Stephen Tierney

The Centre on Constitutional Change applies the best of social scientific scholarship to the questions raised by the UK's evolving

[Sitemap](#) | [Cookies](#) | [Privacy](#) | [Terms of use](#) | [Accessibility](#)



We use cookies on this website. By using this site, you agree that we may store and access

cookies on your device. [Find out more here](#)

